DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 386 JC 940 106

AUTHOR Walters, Judy E.
TITLE AB 1725 Accountability: Work in Progress. A Report.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE 10 Mar 94
NOTE 46p.; Prepared as Agenda Item Number 12 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, March 10, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; *College Administration; *College Governing Councils; *College Outcomes Assessment; *College Planning; Community Colleges; Educational Legislation; *Institutional Research; Program Effectiveness; School Effectiveness; Self Evaluation (Groups); Strategic Planning; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS Assembly Bill 1725 (California 1989); *California Community Colleges; Student Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

California Assembly Bill 1725 requires the development and implementation of a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system. In response to the bill, the Chancellor's Office (CO) of the California Community Colleges is moving away from its traditional functions of compliance and regulatory activity toward establishing an accountability structure based on student outcomes and district results rather than input measures. An accountability program has been developed which centrally collects information on college outcomes related to student access, student success, student satisfaction, staff composition, and fiscal condition, but also recognizes the importance of locally designed and managed accountability efforts. Obstacles have been identified to implementing the accountability program, including the variance in local management information system capabilities, uneven local research competence, local skepticism, and a patchwork of existing burdensome statewide reporting requirements. The CO's proposal for overcoming these obstacles includes the following five components: (1) the annual publication of a statewide accountability indicators report; (2) annual in-depth studies of individual accountability areas; (3) periodic statewide surveys to assess student satisfaction; (4) more effective data collection and dissemination; and (5) disseminating exemplary accountability models and providing technical assistance to districts. A work-in-progress version of the accountability indicators report and a table of non-participating districts are appended. (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 386

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
March 10, 1994

AB 1725 ACCOUNTABILITY: WORK IN PROGRESS

12

A REPORT

Presentation: *Judy E. Walters, Vice Chancellor*
Policy Analysis and Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 940 106

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
March 10, 1994

AB 1725 ACCOUNTABILITY: WORK IN PROGRESS

12

A REPORT

Presentation: *Judy E. Walters, Vice Chancellor*
Policy Analysis and Development

Issue

This item describes work in progress on the accountability system required by Assembly Bill 1725. It is intended as a brief review of the history of this accountability system and as a preliminary look at the report that is required by the end of the 1993-94 year.

Background

Assembly Bill 1725 requires the development and implementation of a comprehensive community college educational and fiscal accountability system. This system will produce a published report of California Community Colleges' accountability by the end of 1993-94.

Analysis

The Chancellor's Office is moving away from the role of a state agency whose principal functions are compliance and regulatory activity. It is establishing an accountability structure that is based on student outcomes and that holds districts accountable for results rather than input measures.

The initial design of the accountability program called for the centralized collection and reporting of information in five areas: student access, student success, student satisfaction, staff composition, and fiscal condition. Colleges were to report to the Chancellor's Office primarily via the Management Information System.

Subsequent planning emphasizes the importance of viable, local, college-level accountability and institutional effectiveness programs to support and complement

the statewide program. The California Community Colleges' effectiveness as a whole depends on the effectiveness of each individual college. Locally designed and managed accountability programs are needed to serve the needs of particular colleges. A viable accountability program uses information to integrate planning, implementation, and evaluation of state and local programs for continuous improvement of teaching of students and learning.

In January 1991, the Chancellor's Office convened a task force and awarded grants for an accountability pilot program to four community college districts. The final task force report made three recommendations:

1. Improve the capacity of colleges for institutional research and management information system activities that are necessary for accountability and institutional effectiveness.

2. Implement the statewide plan that was developed in a study of accountability program costs.

3. Improve college and Chancellor's Office access to statewide data bases that contain employment and transfer information.

The Chancellor's Office is working in a number of areas to implement the statewide accountability program; staff are coordinating accountability requirements for vocational education, adult education, and student equity. The Planning, Effectiveness and Accountability Unit has consulted with the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Chief Executive Officers Council, the Chief Instructional Officers Council, the Council of Organizations, the Academic Senate, and the Community College League of California. The Chancellor's Office continues to provide technical assistance to local colleges in the development of their own institutional effectiveness and accountability programs.

Conclusion

This report features those accountability indicators that are currently available, including credit enrollment, noncredit enrollment, transition from high school, persistence from term-to-term, successful course completion, and attainment of degrees and certificates. These indicators demonstrate the capability of the Management Information System to provide useful information for the accountability program. Although a brief commentary accompanies the data, more probing analyses will be conducted.

In time, additional data will become available to measure the success of the system to support transfer to four-year institutions, vocational education, and job training. The Chancellor's Office has already begun a long-term effort to document student transfers. The Employment Development Department (State) is cooperating in a

study of wage record data that will document the success of students in obtaining jobs.

Apart from the AB 1725 accountability mandate, there are additional compelling reasons for promoting accountability. First, in the current difficult fiscal climate it is important to focus on effectiveness. As with any organization, the community colleges can be more effective if they can objectively document how well they have attained their goals. Second, with heightened competition for public money, it is important to foster strong public support for community colleges. Open communication of educational and fiscal conditions helps to strengthen public support and confidence in the colleges. Therefore, to embrace accountability satisfies a basic obligation to the welfare of the community colleges. To be accountable reaffirms the public's trust, and it promotes better service to California's students who now, more than ever, need a strong community college system.

Staff: Mark Fetler, Ph.D., Specialist
Planning, Effectiveness and Accountability Unit

AB 1725 Accountability

Work in Progress

Introduction

Public interest in accountability for schools and colleges continues to grow. There are a number of new state and federal programs that include accountability requirements. For example:

- The Higher Education Accountability Program Act of 1991 (AB 1808, Chapter 741, Statutes of 1991, *Education Code* Section 99181) requires the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to develop and adopt a format for an annual report on the performance of public colleges and universities.

- CPEC, in 1993 became the State Postsecondary Review Entity, acting for the federal government, with strengthened student aid program oversight powers.

- The 1993 report of the Commission on Innovation, *Choosing the Future: An Action Agenda for Community Colleges*, recommends restructuring community college governance to enhance local autonomy, strengthen system-level capacity to provide overall direction, and reinforce accountability.

- The federal government has strengthened accountability requirements in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act Amendments of 1990.

- The National Collegiate Athletic Association and the federal government have linked public disclosure of student outcomes to institutional participation in financial programs.

- The California Community Colleges Board of Governors recently adopted a student equity program that includes a local college accountability component.

State and Local Programs

The Chancellor's Office is moving away from its role as a state agency whose principal functions are compliance and regulatory activity. It is establishing an accountability structure that is based on student outcomes and that holds districts accountable for results rather than input measures.

The initial concept for the accountability program called for centralized collection and reporting of information in five areas: student access, student success, student satisfaction, staff composition, and fiscal condition. Colleges were to report to the Chancellor's Office primarily through the Management Information System.

Subsequent planning emphasizes the importance of viable, local, college-level accountability and institutional effectiveness programs to support and complement the statewide program. The California Community Colleges' effectiveness as a whole depends on the effectiveness of each individual college. Locally designed and managed accountability programs are needed to serve the needs of particular colleges. A viable accountability program uses information to integrate planning, implementation, and evaluation of state and local programs for continuous improvement of teaching of students and learning.

In January 1991, the Chancellor's Office convened a task force and awarded grants for an accountability pilot program to four community college districts (Santa Barbara, San Joaquin Delta, Mt. San Antonio, and San Jose-Evergreen). These grants permitted the development of local accountability reports. The local projects provided a framework to integrate planning, research, administration, and instruction. The districts used the grants to hire technicians, to develop hardware and software systems, and to participate at various conferences and planning sessions.

The Chancellor's Office contracted in 1991 with Far West Laboratory to write a technical assistance guide, "Improving It: Accountability by Design," which offers guidelines for educators who wish to design systems for improved institutional productivity and effectiveness at local community colleges. This booklet treats accountability as an opportunity for colleges to verify to themselves and others what their institutions are accomplishing and to design ways to monitor and ensure continued success. The guide is not prescriptive; it helps institutions evaluate their capability to assess their effectiveness, and it poses program design issues that staff will need to decide for themselves.

The rationale and design of a statewide accountability program derives from a 1991 cost study, "California Community College Accountability: State and Local Implementation Costs," produced by Strategic Planning Associates under a contract with the Chancellor's Office. The study drew on interviews with the officials of the Chancellor's Office, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the Department of Finance, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the pilot program members, and ten additional community college districts.

The cost study described obstacles to a state program and strategies for overcoming them. The four main obstacles to accountability are: (1) great variance in local management information system capabilities, (2) uneven local research competence,

(3) local skepticism, and (4) a patchwork of existing burdensome statewide reporting requirements.

The overarching strategy to overcome these obstacles is to obtain local funding for college programs. However, local funding for accountability programs, as well as funding for a modest Chancellor's Office program, awaits a more favorable fiscal climate. The Chancellor's Office proposal has five components:

1. Statewide accountability indicators report. The Chancellor's Office will annually compile information from the Management Information System and other routinely collected data.

   ***Status**: A work-in-progress version of the report is included in this Board item. It demonstrates the ability of the Chancellor's Office to collect and display basic accountability information.*

2. Annual in-depth accountability studies. These studies would complement the indicators report by providing a detailed understanding of a single accountability area.

   ***Status**: This activity requires additional resources.*

3. Statewide surveys. The Chancellor's Office will periodically commission scientific sample surveys to assess student satisfaction.

   ***Status**: This activity requires additional resources.*

4. More effective data collection and dissemination. The Chancellor's Office will develop a long-range plan to reduce the response burden placed on districts by multiple information demands.

   ***Status**: Program units in the Chancellor's Office are reviewing data collection procedures. Recent discussion of proposals for regulatory relief should result in less burdensome reporting by colleges. Within the Chancellor's Office, staff are coordinating the development of accountability requirements for vocational education programs and student equity programs. The Planning, Effectiveness and Accountability Unit has consulted with the California Postsecondary Education Commission on the design of the intersegmental accountability program required by the Higher Education Accountability Program Act of 1991 (AB 1808).*

5. Depository and/or Clearinghouse. The Chancellor's Office will serve as a depository for exemplary accountability models and will provide technical assistance to districts.

   ***Status**: A newsletter, "Planning, Effectiveness & Accountability," appears monthly and provides technical information to colleges.*

Current Activities

The Planning, Effectiveness and Accountability Unit has worked to communicate information about the Chancellor's Office accountability programs and to coordinate and streamline the development of those accountability programs. The primary opportunities for such communication and cooperation are through conference presentations, participation in Chancellor's Office committees, and participation in external agency committees. Following is a list of activities that have taken place during the past year.

Conference Presentations

Understanding the State Accountability System. Academic Senate for California Community College's 25th Annual Fall Session. (Panel discussion, November 1993)

Institutional Accountability in California Community Colleges. Annual Conference of the Community College League of California, Burlingame. (Panel discussion, November 1993)

California Association for Institutional Research Annual Conference. (Panel discussion of models for cooperation between higher education and K-12, November 1993)

Introduction to the Internet. Research and Planning Group workshop at Solano Community College. (A discussion of Internet technology and ways that it can serve accountability programs. June 1993)

Learning Networks: A Cross-Agency Information System to Increase Learner Access. Annual Student Services Conference of the Chancellor's Office, Irvine. (Panel discussion of technology for collecting and reporting program and learning information. June 1993)

Data for Decisions: Putting Accountability to Work. Annual Student Services Conference of the Chancellor's Office, Irvine. (Panel discussion, April 1993)

Data for Decisions: Putting Accountability to Work. Annual Conference of the Community College Research and Planning Group, Lake Tahoe. (Workshop, March 1993)

Chancellor's Office Committees

Student Equity Planning Committee. Coordinates accountability data collection to avoid any duplicative, unnecessary, or burdensome reporting of data by colleges. (Ongoing in 1993-94)

Matriculation Technical Advisory Group. Monitors local college matriculation assessment programs and the types of information of relevance for local accountability programs that these programs produce. (Ongoing in 1993-94)

Adult Education Learning Network Task Force. Monitors the design of program information and learner information data bases that may be developed for adult noncredit education programs of relevance for local accountability programs. (Ongoing in 1993)

Vocational Education Committee of Practitioners. Assists in the coordination of the design of vocational education accountability programs with other Chancellor's Office accountability programs in order to avoid any duplicative, unnecessary, or burdensome reporting. (Ongoing in 1993)

Intersegmental Coordinating Council Committees

California Student Information System. Assists in the coordination of the design of an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) system that would span K-12 and higher education in order to avoid any duplicative, unnecessary, or burdensome reporting. (Ongoing in 1993-94)

School Improvement Committee. Monitors the development of programs for collaboration of K-12 and higher education, particularly with regard to accountability and assessment requirements. (Ongoing in 1993)

Time to Degree. Assists in the development of a report that makes recommendations for intersegmental reporting on the time students require to earn degrees. (Ongoing in 1993)

California Postsecondary Education Commission Higher Education Accountability Report Advisory Committee (AB 1808). Coordinates with CPEC in the design of a higher education accountability system. (Spring 1993)

CalPlan Vocational Education Committee of the Community Colleges and the Department of Education. Provides input with regard to accountability and assessment for the design of a strategic plan for vocational education. (Ongoing in 1993)

Community College League of California Education Policy Committee. Discusses Chancellor's Office accountability programs. (January 1994)

Commission on Innovation. Provides input regarding Chancellor's Office accountability programs. (Ongoing in 1993)

Statewide Report

The reporting of performance indicators is an essential part of the accountability program. Broadly defined, an "indicator" is a measurement of the educational or fiscal condition of the California Community Colleges. There are numerous indicators of potential interest to various stakeholders, but the interests of statewide governing bodies and the burden of data collection limit how much information can be reported. Local colleges may wish to supplement the statewide indicators with additional measures of local conditions. The following statewide report is primarily based on data available from the Chancellor's Office Management Information System Unit. The Appendix displays which colleges have or have not provided the information required for this report. Other sources of data were the Chancellor's Office Fiscal Data Abstract and files maintained by the Fiscal and Business Services Unit.

Purely descriptive information that does not provide an opportunity for comparisons has limited value for analytical, evaluative, or accountability purposes. Where possible, statewide results will be disaggregated and shared with local districts; however, the interpretation of local results should rest with the district. College demographics vary across many dimensions that are not covered in a statewide report, e.g., the socioeconomic level of the populations that are served.

There are some limitations on the interpretation of the statewide data. Ideally, every college would provide complete information every year. In practice, when some colleges do not report there is a possibility of bias in the statewide results. That is, the reason for not reporting may be correlated with the measures being reported. Even commonly accepted procedures for correcting such bias are not completely effective and they complicate the interpretation of data. A related problem is found in the relatively large number of students who do not report their ethnicity. This non-response also raises the issue of bias and the problems associated with the attempt to make adjustments in the data. In any case, attempts to correct for bias are time consuming, are difficult to interpret, and may not be successful. The preferred solution is to obtain higher levels of response from colleges and students. The currently available data should not be used for longitudinal trend analysis. Once college participation in the Management Information System has become universal and of consistently high quality, longitudinal trend analysis will be one of the main benefits derived from both statewide and local college accountability data.

Conclusion

This report features accountability indicators that are currently available, including credit enrollment, noncredit enrollment, transition from high school, persistence from term-to-term, successful course completion, and attainment of degrees and certificates. These indicators demonstrate the capability of the Management Information System to provide useful information for the accountability program. A record of which colleges have or have not provided information required for this

report is appended. Although a brief commentary accompanies the data, more analyses will be conducted.

Apart from the AB 1725 accountability mandate, there are additional compelling reasons for promoting accountability. First, in the current difficult fiscal climate it is important to focus on effectiveness. As with any organization, the community colleges can be more effective if they can objectively document how well they have attained their goals. Second, with heightened competition for public money, it is important to foster strong public support for community colleges. Open communication of educational and fiscal conditions helps to strengthen public support and confidence in the colleges. Therefore, to embrace accountability satisfies a basic obligation to the welfare of the community colleges. To be accountable reaffirms the public's trust, and it promotes better service to California's students who now, more than ever, need a strong community college system.

1.11 General Participation: Credit. The number and proportion of students enrolling compared to their proportion in the general population is a basic measure of access and has implications for the amount of resources needed to provide adequate levels of service.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991			Fall 1992		
	Number	Percent	Census 18-64	Number	Percent	Census 18-64	Number	Percent	Census 18-64
Total Enrolled	1,209,957	100.0	100.0	1,312,305	100.0	100.0	1,317,865	100.0	100.0
Men	542,886	44.9	51.0	590,638	45.0	51.0	590,396	44.8	51.1
Women	663,444	54.8	49.0	719,878	54.9	49.0	724,721	54.9	48.9
Amer. Indian	14,930	1.2	n/a	15,622	1.2	n/a	15,566	1.2	n/a
Asian	115,761	9.6	n/a	136,404	10.4	n/a	147,843	11.2	n/a
Black	90,353	7.5	7.0	99,307	7.6	7.0	101,377	7.7	7.0
Filipino	34,437	2.8	n/a	41,879	3.2	n/a	45,388	3.4	n/a
Hispanic	196,667	16.3	24.5	232,525	17.7	25.2	247,520	18.8	25.9
White	693,230	57.3	58.6	722,312	55.0	57.6	695,770	52.8	56.7
Unknown	64,579	5.3	n/a	64,256	4.9	n/a	64,401	4.9	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	9.9	n/a	n/a	10.2	n/a	n/a	10.5
No. of Colleges Reporting	97			104			106		
Disabled Students	20,756	1.7		25,366	1.9		33,743	2.5	
No. of Colleges Reporting	76			93			106		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of January 31, 1994. The census data reflect percentages of California's adult population, aged 18-64, and were taken from the 1993 series population projections published by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance.

Comments

- Percentages for women are slightly higher than corresponding adult population percentages.
- Percentages for Hispanics are somewhat lower than corresponding adult population percentages.

1.12 General Participation: Non-Credit. The number and proportion of students enrolling compared to their proportion in the general population is a basic measure of access and has implications for the amount of resources needed to provide adequate levels of service.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991			Fall 1992		
	Number	Percent	Census 18-64	Number	Percent	Census 18-64	Number	Percent	Census 18-64
Total Enrolled	171,646	100.0	100.0	200,733	100.0	100.0	193,897	100.0	100.0
Men	68,501	39.9	51.0	77,862	38.8	51.0	72,843	37.6	51.1
Women	100,225	58.4	49.0	118,199	58.9	49.0	115,476	59.6	48.9
Amer. Indian	1,076	0.6	n/a	1,245	0.6	n/a	1,240	0.6	n/a
Asian	25,098	14.6	n/a	30,975	15.4	n/a	29,983	15.5	n/a
Black	6,017	3.5	7.0	8,726	4.3	7.0	7,992	4.1	7.0
Filipino	2,538	1.5	n/a	3,350	1.7	n/a	3,018	1.6	n/a
Hispanic	48,110	28.0	24.5	55,178	27.5	25.2	52,748	27.2	25.9
White	66,176	38.6	58.6	76,095	37.9	57.6	76,423	39.4	56.7
Unknown	22,631	13.2	n/a	25,164	12.5	n/a	22,493	11.6	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	9.9	n/a	n/a	10.2	n/a	n/a	10.5
No. of Colleges Reporting	62			63			68		
Disabled Students	2,390	1.4		3,647	1.8		5,375	2.8	
No. of Colleges Reporting	25			33			42		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of January 31, 1994. Population statistics are from the U.S. Census as published by the Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit.

Comments

- Not all colleges offer non-credit classes and this may partly account for the low number of colleges reporting.

1.2. Transition from high school. The percent of high school graduates enrolling first-time in a credit or non-credit course within two years following graduation. High schools are one important source of community college students. Information about the flow of students from high school to community colleges can be useful for planning tech-prep and is a leading indicator of the eventual total number of students enrolling. The percent of high school graduates is provided for comparison. The credit enrollment figures in Table 1.11 also provide an interpretive context.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991			Fall 1992		
	Number	Percent	Percent H.S. Grads	Number	Percent	Percent H.S. Grads	Number	Percent	Percent H.S. Grads
Total	90,781	100.0	100.0	100,163	100.0	100.0	107,352	100.0	100.0
Men	45,438	50.1	49.3	50,120	50.0	49.2	53,375	49.7	n/a
Women	45,243	49.8	50.7	49,923	49.8	50.8	53,826	50.1	n/a
Amer. Indian	1,116	1.2	0.8	1,224	1.2	0.9	1,352	1.3	0.9
Asian	8,153	9.0	11.2	9,859	9.8	11.2	11,156	10.5	10.8
Black	7,382	8.1	7.4	7,954	7.9	7.3	8,332	7.8	7.2
Filipino	3,409	3.8	2.9	4,205	4.2	2.9	4,640	4.3	2.9
Hispanic	20,679	22.8	23.3	23,298	23.3	25.3	26,766	25.0	27.1
White	46,746	51.5	54.6	50,196	50.1	52.5	50,922	47.6	50.6
Unknown	3,296	3.6	n/a	3,427	3.4	n/a	3,784	3.5	n/a
No. of Colleges Reporting	91			98			100		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of September 30, 1993. High school graduation data was obtained from CPEC student profiles for 1990 and from CDE for 1992.

Comments

- Hispanic percentages are somewhat lower than corresponding adult population percentages.

2.11 Persistence: Credit. The number of credit students who are enrolling for two consecutive terms, i.e., who enroll in the fall and persist to enroll again in the spring. While not all students will require a full year to satisfy their goals, the completion of a degree, obtaining of certificates, or satisfaction of transfer requirements takes more time. The credit enrollment figures from Table 1.11 are shown in order to provide an interpretive context.

	Fall1990-Spring 1991			Fall 1991-Spring 1992			Fall 1992-Spring 1993		
	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment
Total Enrolled	688,240	100.0	100.0	780,266	100.0	100.0	728,358	100.0	100.0
Men	306,597	44.5	44.9	346,162	44.4	45.0	320,778	44.0	44.8
Women	380,337	55.3	54.8	433,271	55.5	54.9	406,561	55.8	54.9
Amer. Indian	8,060	1.2	1.2	8,859	1.1	1.2	8,188	1.1	1.2
Asian	74,296	10.8	9.6	91,264	11.7	10.4	92,271	12.7	11.2
Black	47,870	7.0	7.5	55,134	7.1	7.6	50,677	7.0	7.7
Filipino	21,146	3.1	2.8	26,887	3.4	3.2	25,737	3.5	3.4
Hispanic	115,725	16.8	16.3	143,614	18.4	17.7	147,020	20.2	18.8
White	386,475	56.2	57.3	418,792	53.7	55.0	370,995	50.9	52.8
Unknown	34,677	5.0	5.3	35,716	4.6	4.9	33,470	4.6	4.9
No. of Colleges Reporting	93			103			98		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of October 5, 1993. Counts reflect students who were enrolled for credit in both terms. For quarter schools the counts reflect fall to subsequent term enrollment.

Comment

- Women tend to persist at higher rates than men.
- The percentage of Hispanics persisting is somewhat higher than the corresponding percent credit enrollment.

2.12 Course Completion: Credit C or Better. The number of enrollments in credit courses that are completed with a C or better. Course grades are a means of measuring student attainment of course goals and a commonly accepted student outcome. The credit enrollment figures from Table 1.11 are shown in order to provide an interpretive context.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991			Fall 1992		
	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment
Total (Sum of A, B, C, D)	2,076,464	100.0	100.0	2,309,271	100.0	100.0	2,272,248	100.0	100.0
Men	879,098	42.3	44.9	975,351	42.2	45.0	946,354	41.6	44.8
Women	1,066,001	51.1	54.8	1,189,422	51.5	54.9	1,183,755	52.1	54.9
Amer. Indian	22,923	1.1	1.2	24,584	1.1	1.2	23,856	1.0	1.2
Asian	215,232	10.4	9.6	262,505	11.4	10.4	280,860	12.4	11.2
Black	127,764	6.2	7.5	145,753	6.3	7.6	138,144	6.1	7.7
Filipino	59,682	2.9	2.8	74,119	3.2	3.2	75,741	3.3	3.4
Hispanic	298,525	14.4	16.3	359,328	15.6	17.7	384,866	16.9	18.8
White	1,127,703	54.3	57.3	1,205,099	52.2	55.0	1,134,368	49.9	52.8
Unknown	69,226	3.3	5.3	65,557	2.8	4.9	66,634	2.9	4.9
No. of Colleges Reporting	96			104			104		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of October 12, 1993. A designated grade of A, B, C, or CR in a credit course counts as a successful course completion.

Comment

- A greater proportion of women than men earn grades of C or better.
- The large numbers of students with missing gender or ethnicity data makes interpretation of this table difficult.

2.13 Course Completion: Credit D or Better. The number of enrollments in credit courses that are completed with a C or better. Course grades are a means of measuring student attainment of course goals and a commonly accepted student outcome. The credit enrollment figures from Table 1.11 are shown in order to provide an interpretive context.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991			Fall 1992		
	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment
Total (Sum of A, B, C, D)	2,076,464	100.0	100.0	2,309,271	100.0	100.0	2,272,248	100.0	100.0
Men	943,332	45.4	44.9	1,046,781	45.3	45.0	1,015,671	44.7	44.8
Women	1,128,307	54.3	54.8	1,260,048	54.6	54.9	1,252,854	55.1	54.9
Amer. Indian	24,558	1.2	1.2	26,389	1.1	1.2	25,521	1.1	1.2
Asian	229,428	11.0	9.6	279,955	12.1	10.4	298,519	13.1	11.2
Black	141,437	6.8	7.5	161,611	7.0	7.6	153,106	6.7	7.7
Filipino	64,883	3.1	2.8	80,464	3.5	3.2	81,922	3.6	3.4
Hispanic	326,018	15.7	16.3	392,709	17.0	17.7	420,383	18.5	18.8
White	1,186,500	57.1	57.3	1,266,433	54.8	55.0	1,191,054	52.4	52.8
Unknown	79,992	3.9	5.3	69,334	3.0	4.9	70,303	3.1	4.9
No. of Colleges Reporting	96			104			104		

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of October 12, 1993. A designated grade of A, B, C, or CR in a credit course counts as a successful course completion.

Comment

- A greater proportion of women than men earn grades of C or better.
- The lare numbers of students with missing gender or ethnicity data makes interpretation of this table difficult.

2.2 Completion. Attainment of a degree or certificate, which depends on access, student persistence, and the instructional program is an important student outcome. Other important outcomes, e.g., transfer and job placement will be reflected when the necessary data are available. The credit enrollment figures from Table 1.11 are shown to provide an interpretive context.

Academic Year 1991-1992

	Degrees Awarded		Certificates Awarded		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Percent Credit Enrollment
Total	44,073	100.0	18,388	100.0	100.0
Men	17,062	38.7	8,409	45.7	45.0
Women	26,979	61.2	9,959	54.2	54.9
Amer. Indian	541	1.2	245	1.3	1.2
Asian	4,627	10.5	2,061	11.2	10.4
Black	2,814	6.4	1,140	6.2	7.6
Filipino	1,237	2.8	615	3.3	3.2
Hispanic	5,672	12.9	2,612	14.2	17.7
White	27,371	62.1	10,921	59.4	55.0
Unknown	1,811	4.1	794	4.3	4.9
No. of Colleges Reporting	95				

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Management Information System and are based on full term reporting as of October 13, 1993. The counts reflect the number of degrees or certificates awarded during the designated year. Student awards are not granted until applied for. The number of awards reported in one year will also include awards actually earned but not applied for in earlier years.

Comment

- A higher proportion of women than men attain degrees.
- Women also earn more certificates than men.
- The percentages of Blacks and Hispanics earning degrees and certificates are less than corresponding credit enrollment.

4.11 Staff Diversity - Full Time Faculty. Staff composition affects campus climate, particularly for underrepresented students. This indicator supports equal employment opportunity policies that are firmly ingrained in federal, state, and local education practices. U.S. Census adult population data from Table 1.11 are provided for comparison.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991		
	Number	Percent	EEO Percent	Number	Percent	EEO Percent
Total Employee	16,647	100.0	n/a	16,835	100.0	n/a
Men	10,088	60.6	43.1	9,865	58.6	43.1
Women	6,559	39.4	56.9	6,970	41.4	56.9
Amer. Indian	117	0.7	0.6	151	0.9	0.6
Asian	682	4.1	7.8	774	4.6	7.8
Black	932	5.6	5.3	959	5.7	5.3
Filipino	67	0.4	n/a	67	0.4	n/a
Hispanic	1,115	6.7	9.8	1,245	7.4	9.8
White	13,734	82.5	n/a	13,639	81.0	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Unit Student Records System. Updated data from the Management Information System will be available in 1995. The source of these data was the January 1993 Board of Governors Agenda, "Systemwide EEO-6 Categories Full-Time Minority Hiring Rates. EEO percents are derived from the "Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Data for Professional Occupations of Postsecondary Education: Statewide Data Analysis," published by the Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office in January 1993.

Comment

- The percentage of women faculty is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Hispanic faculty is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.

4.12 Staff Diversity - Full Time Executive. Staff composition affects campus climate, particularly for underrepresented students. This indicator supports equal employment opportunity policies that are firmly ingrained in federal, state, and local education practices. U.S. Census adult population data from Table 1.11 are provided for comparison.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991		
	Number	Percent	EEO Percent	Number	Percent	EEO Percent
Total Employed	2,688	100.0		2,641	100.0	
Men	1,717	63.9	46.7	1,643	62.2	46.7
Women	971	36.1	53.3	998	37.8	53.3
Amer. Indian	31	1.2	0.7	31	1.2	0.7
Asian	91	3.4	5.7	95	3.6	5.7
Black	266	9.9	9.5	270	10.2	9.5
Filipino	17	0.6	n/a	21	0.8	n/a
Hispanic	257	9.6	11.3	286	10.8	11.3
White	2,026	75.4	n/a	1,938	73.4	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Unit Student Records System. Updated data from the Management Information System will be available in 1995. The source of these data was the January 1993 Board of Governors Agenda, "Systemwide EEO-6 Categories Full-Time Minority Hiring Rates. EEO percents are derived from the "Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Data for Professional Occupations of Postsecondary Education: Statewide Data Analysis," published by the Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office in January 1993.

Comment

- The percentage of women executive staff is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Asian executive staff is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Hispanic executive staff is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.

4.13 Staff Diversity - Full Time Professional. Staff composition affects campus climate, particularly for underrepresented students. This indicator supports equal employment opportunity policies that are firmly ingrained in federal, state, and local education practices. U.S. Census adult population data from Table 1.11 are provided for comparison.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991		
	Number	Percent	EEO Percent	Number	Percent	EEO Percent
Total Employed	2,140	100.0		2,070	100.0	
Men	903	42.1	50.7	845	40.8	50.7
Women	1,237	57.8	49.3	1,225	59.2	49.3
Amer. Indian	17	0.8	0.5	15	0.7	0.5
Asian	154	7.2	10.1	155	7.5	10.1
Black	272	12.7	6.9	275	13.3	6.9
Filipino	66	3.1	n/a	64	3.1	n/a
Hispanic	306	14.3	11.1	282	13.6	11.1
White	1,325	61.9	n/a	1,279	61.8	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Unit Student Records System. Updated data from the Management Information System will be available in 1995. The source of these data was the January 1993 Board of Governors Agenda, "Systemwide EEO-6 Categories Full-Time Minority Hiring Rates. EEO percents are derived from the "Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Data for Professional Occupations of Postsecondary Education: Statewide Data Analysis," published by the Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office in January 1993.

Comment

- The percentage of men professional staff is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Black professional staff is greater than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Hispanic professional staff is greater than the corresponding EEO percentage.

4.14 Staff Diversity - Full Time Classified. Staff composition affects campus climate, particularly for underrepresented students. This indicator supports equal employment opportunity policies that are firmly ingrained in federal, state, and local education practices. U.S. Census adult population data from Table 1.11 are provided for comparison.

	Fall 1990			Fall 1991		
	Number	Percent	EEO Percent	Number	Percent	EEO Percent
Total Employed	15,981	100.0		16,422	100.0	
Men	6,201	38.8	56.0	6,372	38.8	56.0
Women	9,780	61.2	44.0	10,050	61.2	44.0
Amer. Indian	144	0.9	0.8	148	0.9	0.8
Asian	1,055	6.6	9.5	1,117	6.8	9.5
Black	1,774	11.1	6.1	1,855	11.3	6.1
Filipino	368	2.3	n/a	378	2.3	n/a
Hispanic	2,541	15.9	22.7	2,693	16.3	22.7
White	10,099	63.2	n/a	10,231	62.3	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes: Data are taken from the Statewide California Community Colleges Unit Student Records System. Updated data from the Management Information System will be available in 1995. The source of these data was the January 1993 Board of Governors Agenda, "Systemwide EEO-6 Categories Full-Time Minority Hiring Rates. EEO percents are derived from the "Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Data for Professional Occupations of Postsecondary Education: Statewide Data Analysis," published by the Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office in January 1993. (Percent of working labor force)

Comment

- The percentage of women classified staff is greater than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Hispanic classified staff is less than the corresponding EEO percentage.
- The percentage of Black classified staff is greater than the corresponding EEO percentage.

5.1 Community College Funding. Overall level of funding for local districts. General fund revenues in millions of dollars.

	1990-1991		1991-1992			1992-1993		
	Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total	Percent Change	Amount	Percent of Total	Percent Change
Federal	$126	4	$120	4	(4.8)	$119	4	(0.8)
State	$1,897	62	$1,807	59	(4.7)	$1,612	52	(10.8)
Local	$1,061	34	$1,147	37	8.1	$1,390	44	21.2
Total	$3,084	100	$3,074	100	(0.3)	$3,121		(1.5)

Notes: Data are taken from the Chancellor's Office Fiscal Data Abstract for 1990-91 and 1991-92. This fiscal information regards the districts' general fund, which is the operational fund and accounts for most district revenues. Community college districts are funded on a formula basis consisting of the following components: base, inflation, equalization and growth. In addition to the general purpose funding, districts receive funds for apprenticeship hours and categorical programs. Additional information is available on request to the Fiscal and Business Services Unit.

Comment

- Since 1990-1991 the proportion of local funding has increased and state funding has decreased.
- Despite an increase in local funds for 1991-1992, there has been an overall decline in funds from the prior year.

5.2 Fiscal Stability. The number of districts at fiscal risk. Districts have a fiduciary trust in handling public money. The way in which money is handled has a long term effect on the health of the district and the quality of services that can be delivered to students.

	1990-1991		1991-1992		1992-1993	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High Risk	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0
Medium Risk	4	3.7	2	1.8	2	1.8
Low Risk	10	9.3	11	10.2	11	10.2

Notes: Data are taken from the Chancellor's Office Fiscal & Program Standards Accountability Unit.
This indicator has been traditionally computed in order to provide local districts with an early warning of possible fiscal difficulties. It is a composite indicator that takes into account patterns of funding, expenditures, and local fund balances. Although this indicator is computed quarterly, only the end of year or fourth quarter measure is reported here.

High Risk means that the district will need to take immediate action in order to avoid default.
Medium Risk means that a district could face default within the next six to eighteen months if action is not taken.
Low Risk means that a district could face default within the next eighteen months to three years if no action is taken.

Comment
- No districts have been at high risk over the last three years, despite decreases in funding.
- The number of districts at medium or low risk has remained stable or declined over the last three years.

California Community Colleges
Management Information Services

Accountability Reports District Non-Participation

(Reports 1.11 through 2.13 are based on Fall 1992 data submissions.
Report 1.12 (Non-Credit) is not represented in this chart because not all districts have non-credit programs.
Report 2.2 is based on annual data submitted for academic year 1991-1992.

Distric	Report 1.11 Fall 1992	Report 1.2 Fall 1992	Report 2.11 Fall 1992	Reports 2.12 and 2.13 Fall 1992	Report 2.2 Academic Yr 1991-1992
Allan Hancock Joint					
Antelope Valley					
Barstow					
Butte					
Cabrillo					
Cerritos					
Chabot-Las Positas			X		
Chaffey					
Citrus		X			X
Coast					
Compton					
Contra Costa					
Desert					
El Camino					
Feather River					
Foothill-DeAnza					

APPENDIX

District	Report 1.11 Fall 1992	Report 1.2 Fall 1992	Report 2.11 Fall 1992	Reports 2.12 and 2.13 Fall 1992	Report 2.2 Academic Yr 1991-1992
Fremont-Newark					
Gavilan Joint			X		X
Glendale					
Grossmont-Cuyamaca					
Hartnell					
Imperial					X
Kern					
Lake Tahoe		X	X		
Lassen			X		X
Long Beach					
Los Angeles					
Los Rios					
Marin					
Mendocino Lake					
Merced					
Mira Costa					
Monterey Peninsula					
Mt. San Antonio					
Mt. San Jacinto					
Napa Valley			X		X

District	Report 1.11 Fall 1992	Report 1.2 Fall 1992	Report 2.11 Fall 1992	Reports 2.12 and 2.13 Fall 1992	Report 2.2 Academic Yr 1991-1992
North Orange County					
Palo Verde					
Palomar					
Pasadena					
Peralta					
Rancho Santiago					
Redwoods					
Rio Hondo					
Riverside					
Saddleback					
San Bernardino		X			X
San Diego			X	X	
San Francisco					X
San Joaquin Delta					
San Jose					
San Luis Obispo					
San Mateo County					
Santa Barbara					
Santa Clarita					

District	Report 1.11 Fall 1992	Report 1.2 Fall 1992	Report 2.11 Fall 1992	Reports 2.12 and 2.13 Fall 1992	Report 2.2 Academic Yr 1991-1992
Santa Monica					
Sequoias					
Shasta Tehama Trinity					
Sierra Joint					
Siskiyou Joint					
Solano County					
Sonoma County					
Southwestern					
State Center					
Ventura County		X			X
Victor Valley					
West Hills					
West Kern					
West Valley-Mission					
Yosemite					
Yuba					

NOTE: An "X" indicates district data was not used in the reports when one or more elements required to produce the reports was missing or incomplete. For each report the required elements are listed on the following page.